



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

A

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/676,469	09/30/2003	Albert K. Henning	RED-P001	7536
7590	04/05/2005		EXAMINER	
Fernandez & Associates, LLP PO Box D Menlo Park, CA 94026-6402			FOX, JOHN C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3753	
DATE MAILED: 04/05/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/676,469	HENNING ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
John Fox	3753	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1,3 and 5-10 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) 2 and 4 is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) 1-10 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/30/2003.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: ____ .

This action is responsive to the communication filed September 30, 2003.

The specification is objected to. It is unclear what reference [10] is. Only nine references have been cited.

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-9, drawn to a valve, classified in class 137, subclass 625.28.
- II. Claim 10, drawn to a method of maximizing flow, classified in class 137, subclass 2.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because:

Inventions II and I are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus such as a valve with through flow.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

To expedite prosecution an action on the merits follows.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Robbins.

Robbins shows a diaphragm valve where inlet ports 16 and outlet ports 18 are read as being formed in a plate, and the threaded actuator inherently provides proportionate control.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang (US 6,412,751) in view of Suzuki.

Wang teaches a microvalve with proportionate control of diaphragm 162, raised seat 115 surrounding inlet 110, outlets 102, where the inlet and outlets extend through plate 101. Wang does not teach a convoluted seat, though. Suzuki teaches a flow control valve with seats having an increased periphery to increase the flow rate for a given flow area. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided the inlet of Wang with such a convoluted shape to similarly provide for increased flow therethrough.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over van der Wijngmart ([8] cited by Applicant).

van der Wijngmart teaches a microvalve and notes that the increased periphery of the flow ports increases the flow capacity of the valve. The variables recited

are believed to be known and the method is seen to be inherent to the design of an increased flow capacity valve such as taught by van der Wijngmart.

Claims 3 and 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of van der Wijngmart.

Wang teaches the claimed valve except for the plurality of controlled ports 110. van der Wijngmart teaches that using a plurality of ports instead of a single port such as Wang use will increase the flow capacity of the valve. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided a plurality of controlled ports 110 in the valve of Wang to desirably increase the flow capacity of the valve. The features of the dependent claims are considered to be obvious matters of design choice in view of the state of the art.

Claims 2 and 4 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Barth shows proportionate flow control.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Fox whose telephone number is 571-272-4912. The examiner can normally be reached on Increased Flextime.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gene Mancene can be reached on 571-272-4930. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



John Fox
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3753